A U M

Birth is not the beginning of the spirit; life is the remembrance, or a waking up of spirit.
—BRONSON ALCOTT

THEOSOPHY

Vol. L August, 1962 No. 10

TOMORROW IS ALL ABOUT

IN these middle years of the twentieth century, it is rapidly becoming apparent that the great need of mankind is for a sense of balance, a feeling of order and meaning. One might say, of course, that these qualities of maturity are born from knowledge of the Truth, and this is so; but the Western world is only now recovering from the delusion of supposing it *had* the truth, so that some kind of interval—some period of adjustment, however nervous or desperate—seems to be needed before the hunger for balance can be reinterpreted and seen as a demand for ideas that will light up the human predicament.

Meanwhile, Theosophists might well take some account of the balance they have been able to acquire from their studies and reflections. There is first the idea of absolute continuity which comes from the teaching of the pilgrim-soul. Here is no difficulty with the problem of *identity.* The identity of the ego is plain in the doctrines of Theosophy. Yet the sense of egoic identity is a function in decision, not a speech to be delivered, nor a profundity to be confided. No self-observing person can fail to notice the frightening degree to which the ordinary sense of identity is a social product—dependent, that is, upon what others think as well as upon what one thinks of himself. Stripped to sheer egoity, what would we be? Adepts or madmen, sages or horror-struck infants in flight to ancient psychic havens. The student is one who seeks his birth as an individual, not one who is fully born. And the matrix of birth is his place and time, it is the pain of standing alone, the pain of the world and his fellows at that place and time. Seeing this is the balance that is possible in the present hour.

Then there is the patience inspired by the teaching of evolution, by the story of unfolding powers and faculties of all the potentialities of man which slowly flower into final maturity. Patience is a form of balance. But here, again, patience is a realized state of feeling, an absence of anxiety, a refusal to "worry," and not a preachment of philosophy. Who lives in the equilibrium of the timeless, yet participates in the eccentric motion of our chaotic cycle? Only the adepts, wherever they are. Yet there is the patience of the one who has not yet patience, in whom the presence of impatience rankles—of the one who wants to be, yet is not free. This is the patience, imperfect, only dreamed of, practiced as a *tour de force,* which belongs to those who have an ideal. It is better than the lethargy of the insensitive, nobler than the withdrawal of the defeated. It is the patience we can have while the world twists with anguish in uncertainty and fear.

There is the courage of the one who is able to say to himself that he comes of the Promethean race, even as he stumbles like a clown or a fool before the sophisticated gaze of mortals who have the narrow discipline of their curtailed expectations. But little comfort comes from this secret courage in the heart. Who sees it? What pride is there in a nobility that the world has no will to understand? So it is not a familiar virtue, after all, nor anything that requires an audience, nor anything that is cast down by remaining hidden.

These are strange satisfactions. They will never lift the spirits, for the spirit they belong to has no need of being lifted up. A teacher or a friend can help a person, but the ego requires no help. The ego is simply itself and was and is ever beyond help. And this is the dialogue one holds with himself, until the "Day Be with Us." When will that be? The question is irregular, the longing futile, since to ask is but to put off the day. It was Yesterday for many, and is Today for some. Tomorrow is all about.

A peace with the present and a going back to the work at hand are the only means to the balance all men need.

How can the world learn these things? The world, alas, is ourselves. No Buddha became a Buddha from impatient asking when the stupid world will change its ways. No wise man garnered truth from tired denunciation of the indifference of the multitude to the jewel worn in his bosom. The world is ourselves; it but speaks of its pain and longing with a different speech. It worships before other images than the paling

simulacra disciples know. What we must remember is that all images short of reality are none the less images, until the forms of the age dissolve into the substance of self-being. One set of images is little better than another. The world, it may be, is not so far behind us, after all; or we not so much in advance of the world.

It was a high confidence in the souls of all men that launched the Theosophical Movement. As man matures, so will the cycle mature, and we are not the time-keepers, only criers of some of the hours as they strike. To be a student is to be an observer of a process of awakening to the self. The selves are many, but the process is universal.

THE AUTHENTIC REALM

Time lay, self-concentrated, at rest within the Authentic Existent: it was not yet Time; it was merged in the Authentic and motionless with it. But there was an active principle there, one set on governing itself and realizing itself, and it chose to aim at something more than its present. It stirred from its rest, and Time stirred with it. . . . For the Soul contains an unquiet faculty, always desirous of translating elsewhere what it saw in the Authentic Realm and it could not bear to retain within itself all the dense fulness of its possession. A seed is at rest. The nature-principle within, uncoiling outwards, makes way towards what seems to it a large life; . . . it is so with this faculty, when it produces the Kosmos known to sense—the mimic of the Divine Sphere, moving not in the very movement of the Divine but in its similitude, in an effort to reproduce that of the Divine. To bring this Kosmos into being, the Soul first laid aside its eternity and clothed itself with Time.

—PLOTINUS

FROM "THE ESOTERIC CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS"

[The question "Are the Teachings ascribed to Jesus contradictory?" having been raised by a contributor in *Lucifer* for October, 1887, H. P. Blavatsky, the following month, opened a new series of articles on "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels." The series continued for only three installments, although a fourth was promised. Extended technical quotations and deductions are here omitted, Greek words transliterated, and Latin phrases translated where necessary. What remains are powerful declarations of esoteric philosophy, as contrasted with the dead-letter of some Christian dogmas. The entire article as printed in THEOSOPHY for February and March, 1951, is here reprinted.—Eds. THEOSOPHY]

". . . . Tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign *of thy presence,* and of the consummation of the age?"[1] asked the Disciples of the MASTER, on the Mount of Olives.

THE reply given by the "Man of Sorrow," the *Chrestos,* on his trial, but also on his way to triumph, as *Christos,* or Christ,[2] is prophetic, and very suggestive. It is a warning indeed. The answer must be quoted in full. Jesus . . . said unto them:—

> "Take heed that *no man* lead you astray. For many shall come in my name saying, I am the Christ; and shall lead many astray. And ye shall hear of wars . . . but the end is not yet. *For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines and earthquakes in divers places.* But all these things are the beginning of travail. . . . Many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray . . . then shall the end come . . . when ye see the abomination of desolation which was spoken through Daniel. . . . Then if any man shall say unto you, *Lo, here is the Christ,* or there; believe him not. . . . If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness, go not forth: behold, he is in the inner chambers, believe them not. For as the lightning cometh forth from the East, and is seen even in the West, so shall be the *presence* of the Son of Man," etc., etc.

---

[1] St. Matthew xxiv., 3, *et seq.* The sentences italicised are those which stand corrected in the New Testament after the recent revision in 1881 of the version of *1611;* which version is full of errors, voluntary and involuntary. The word "presence," for "coming," and "the consummation of the age," now standing for "the end of the world," have altered, of late, the whole meaning, even for the most sincere Christians, if we except the Adventists.

[2] He who will not ponder over and master the great difference between the meaning of the two Greek words—*chrestos* and *christos*—must remain blind for ever to the true esoteric meaning of the Gospels; that is to say, to the living Spirit entombed in the sterile dead-letter of the texts, the very Dead Sea fruit of *lip*-Christianity.

Two things become evident *to all* in the above passages, now that their false rendering is corrected in the revision text: (*a*) "the coming of Christ," means *the presence of* CHRISTOS in a regenerated world, and not at all the actual coming in body of "Christ" Jesus; (*b*) this Christ is to be sought neither in the wilderness nor "in the inner chambers," nor in the sanctuary of any temple or Church built by man; for Christ—the true esoteric SAVIOUR—*is no man,* but the DIVINE PRINCIPLE in every human being. He who strives to resurrect the Spirit *crucified in him by his own terrestrial passions,* and buried deep in the "sepulchre" of his sinful flesh; he who has the strength to roll back *the stone of matter* from the door of his own *inner* sanctuary, he *has the risen Christ* in him.[3] The "Son of Man" is no child of the bond-woman—*flesh,* but verily of the free-woman—Spirit,[4] the child of man's own deeds, and the fruit of his own spiritual labour.

On the other hand, at no time since the Christian era, have the precursor signs described in *Matthew* applied so graphically and forcibly to any epoch as they do to our own times. When has nation arisen against nation more than at this time? When have "famines"—another name for destitute pauperism, and the famished multitudes of the proletariat —been more cruel, earthquakes more frequent, or covered such an area simultaneously, as for the last few years? Millenarians and Adventists of robust faith, may go on saying that "the coming of [the carnalised] Christ" is near at hand, and prepare themselves for "the end of the world." Theosophists—at any rate, some of them—who understand the hidden meaning of the universally-expected Avatars, Messiahs, Sosioshes and Christs—know that it is no "end of the world," but "the consummation of the age," *i.e.,* the close of a cycle, which is now fast approaching.[5] If our readers have forgotten the concluding passages of

---

[3] For ye are the temple ("sanctuary" in the *revised* N.T.) of the living God. (II. Cor. vi, 16.)

[4] Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, was feminine with the Jews, as with most ancient peoples, and it was so with the early Christians. *Sophia* of the Gnostics, and the third Sephiroth *Binah* (the *female* Jehovah of the Kabalists), are feminine principles—"Divine Spirit," or *Ruach. "Achath Ruach Elohim Chiim."* "One is *She,* the Spirit of the Elohim of Life," is said in *Sepher Yezirah.*

[5] There are several remarkable cycles that come to a close at the end of this century. First, the 5,000 years of the Kaliyug cycle; again the Messianic cycle of the Samaritan (also Kabalistic) Jews of the man connected with *Pisces* (Ichthys or "Fish-man" *Dag*). It is a cycle, historic and not very long, but very occult, lasting about 2,155 solar years, but having a true significance only when computed by lunar months. It occurred 2410 and 255 B.C., or when the equinox entered into the sign of the *Ram,* and again into that of *Pisces.* When it enters, in a few years, the sign of *Aquarius,* psychologists will have some extra work to do, and the psychic idiosyncrasies of humanity will enter on a great change.

the article, "The Signs of the Times," in *Lucifer* for October last,[6] let them read them over, and they will plainly see the meaning of this particular cycle.

Many and many a time the warning about the "false Christs" and prophets who shall lead people astray has been interpreted by charitable Christians, the worshippers of the dead-letter of their scripture, as applying to mystics generally, and Theosophists most especially. . . . Nevertheless, it seems very evident that the words in Matthew's Gospel and others can hardly apply to Theosophists. For these were never found saying that Christ is "Here" or "There," in wilderness or city, and least of all in the "inner chamber" behind the altar of any modern church. Whether Heathen or Christian by birth, they refuse to materialise and thus degrade that which is the purest and grandest ideal—the symbol of symbols—namely, the immortal Divine Spirit in man, whether it be called Horus, Krishna, Buddha, or Christ. None of them has ever yet said: "I am the Christ"; for those born in the West feel themselves, so far, only *Chrestians,*[7] however much they may strive to become Christians in Spirit. It is to those, who in their great conceit and pride refuse to win the right of such appellation by first leading the life of *Chrestos;* to those who haughtily proclaim themselves *Christians* (the glorified, the anointed) by sole virtue of baptism when but a few days old—that the above-quoted words of Jesus apply most forcibly. Can the prophetic insight of him who uttered this remarkable warning be doubted by any one who sees the numerous "false prophets" and pseudo-apostles (*of Christ*), now roaming over the world? These have split the one divine Truth into fragments, and broken, in the camp of the Protestants alone, the rock of the Eternal Verity into three hundred and fifty pieces, which now represent the bulk of their Dissenting sects. Accepting the number in round figures as 350, and admitting, for argument's sake, that, at least, one of these may have the approximate truth, still 349 *must be necessarily false.* Each of these claims to have Christ exclusively in its "inner chamber," and denies him in all others, while in truth, the great majority of their respective followers daily put Christ to death on the cruciform tree of matter—the "tree of infamy" of the old Romans—indeed!

The worship of the dead-letter in the Bible is but one more form of

---

[6] Reprinted in THEOSOPHY 50:198.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

[7] The earliest Christian author, Justin Martyr, calls, in his first Apology, his co-religionists *Chrestians* [Chrestianoi]—not Christians.

idolatry, nothing better. A fundamental dogma of faith cannot exist under a double-faced Janus form. "Justification" *by Christ* cannot be achieved at one's choice and fancy, *either* by "faith" or by "works," and James, therefore (ii., 25), contradicting Paul (Heb. xi., 31), and *vice versa,*[8] one of them must be wrong. Hence, the Bible is *not* the "Word of God," but contains at best the words of fallible men and *imperfect* teachers. Yet read *esoterically,* it does contain, if not the *whole* truth, still, "nothing but the truth," under whatever allegorical garb. Only: *Quot homines tot sententiae.* ["So many men, so many opinions."]

The "Christ principle," the awakened and glorified Spirit of Truth, being universal and eternal, the true *Christos* cannot be monopolized by any one person, even though that person has chosen to arrogate to himself the title of the "Vicar of Christ," or of the "Head" of that or another State-religion. The spirits of "Chrest" and "Christ" cannot be confined to any creed or sect, only because that sect chooses to exalt itself above the heads of all other religions or sects. The name has been used in a manner so intolerant and dogmatic, especially in our day, that Christianity is now the religion of arrogance *par excellence,* a stepping-stone for ambition, a sinecure for wealth, sham and power; a convenient screen for hypocrisy. The noble epithet of old, the one that made Justin Martyr say that "*from the mere name,* which is imputed to us as a crime, *we are the most excellent*" (*First Apology*), is now degraded. The missionary prides himself with the so-called *conversion* of a heathen, who makes of Christianity ever a *profession,* but rarely a religion, a source of income from the missionary fund, and a pretext, since the blood of Jesus has washed them all by anticipation, for every petty crime, from drunkenness and lying up to theft. That same missionary, however, would not hesitate to publicly condemn the greatest saint to eternal perdition and hell fires if that holy man has only neglected to pass through the fruitless and meaningless form of baptism by water with accompaniment of *lip* prayers and vain ritualism.

We say "lip prayer" and "vain ritualism" knowingly. Few Christians among the laymen are aware even of the true meaning of the word

---

[8] It is but fair to St. Paul to remark that this contradiction is surely due to later tampering with his Epistles. Paul was a Gnostic himself, i.e., a "Son of Wisdom," and an Initiate into the true *mysteries of Christos,* though he may have thundered (or was made to appear to do so) against some Gnostic sects, of which, in his day, there were many. But his Christos was not Jesus of Nazareth, nor any man, as shown so ably in Mr. Gerald Massey's lecture, "Paul, the Gnostic Opponent of Peter." He was an Initiate, a true "Master-Builder" or adept, as described in *Isis Unveiled,* Vol. II, pp. 90-91.

Christ; and those of the clergy who happen to know it (for they are brought up in the idea that to study such subjects is *sinful*) keep the information secret from their parishioners. They demand blind, implicit faith, and *forbid inquiry as the one unpardonable sin,* though nothing of that which leads to the knowledge of the truth can be aught else than holy. For what is "Divine Wisdom," or *Gnosis,* but the essential reality behind the evanescent appearances of objects in nature—the very soul of the manifested LOGOS? Why should men who strive to accomplish union with the one eternal and absolute Deity shudder at the idea of prying into its mysteries—however awful? Why, above all, should they use names and words the very meaning of which is a sealed mystery to them—a mere sound? Is it because an unscrupulous, power-seeking Establishment called a Church has cried "wolf" at every such attempt, and, denouncing it as "blasphemous," has ever tried to kill the spirit of inquiry? But Theosophy, the "divine Wisdom," has never heeded that cry, and has the courage of its opinions. The world of sceptics and fanatics may call it, one—an empty *"ism,"* the other—"Satanism": they can never crush it.

Theosophists have been called Atheists, haters of Christianity, the enemies of God and the gods. They are none of these. Therefore, they have agreed this day to publish a clear statement of their ideas, and a profession of their faith—with regard to monotheism and Christianity, at any rate—and to place it before the impartial reader to judge them and their detractors on the merits of their respective faiths. No truth-loving mind would object to such honest and sincere dealing, nor will it be dazzled by any amount of new light thrown upon the subject, howsoever much startled otherwise. On the contrary, such minds will thank *Lucifer* perhaps, while those of whom it was said *"qui vult decipi decipiatur"*[9]—let them be deceived by all means!

The editors of this magazine propose to give a series of essays upon the hidden meaning or esotericism of the "New Testament." No more than any other scripture of the great world-religions can the Bible be excluded from that class of allegorical and symbolical writings which have been, from the pre-historic ages, the receptacle of the secret teachings of the Mysteries of Initiation, under a more or less veiled form. The primitive writers of the *Logia* (now the Gospels) knew certainly *the* truth, and the *whole* truth; but their successors had, as certainly,

---

[9] "Who wants to be deceived, let him be deceived."—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

only dogma and form, which lead to hierarchical power at heart, rather than the spirit of the so-called Christ's teachings. Hence the gradual perversion. As Higgins truly said, in the Christologia of St. Paul and Justin Martyr, we have the esoteric religion of the Vatican, a refined Gnosticism for the cardinals, a more gross one for the people. It is the latter, only still more materialized and disfigured, which has reached us in our age. * * *

If, indeed, the Bible is forced on the acceptance of the world in its dead-letter meaning, in the face of the modern discoveries by Orientalists and the efforts of independent students and kabalists, it is easy to prophesy that even the present new generations of Europe and America will repudiate it, as all the materialists and logicians have done. For the more one studies ancient religious texts, the more one finds that the ground-work of the New Testament is the same as the ground-work of the Vedas, of the Egyptian theogony, and the Mazdean allegories. * * *

The mystic meaning of . . . "Verily I say unto you, evcept *ye eat the flesh* of the Son of man and *drink his blood,* ye have not life in yourselves," &c., can never be understood or appreciated at its true *occult* value, except by those who hold some of the *seven keys,* and yet care little for St. Peter.[10] These words, whether said by Jesus of Nazareth, or Jeshua Ben-Panthera, are the words of an INITIATE. They have to be interpreted with the help of *three* keys—one opening the *psychic* door, the second that of physiology, and the third that which unlocks the mystery of terrestrial being, by unveiling the inseparable blending of theogony with anthropology. It is for revealing a few of these truths, with the *sole view of saving intellectual mankind from the insanities of materialism and pessimism,* that mystics have often been denounced as the servants of Antichrist, even by those Christians who are most worthy, sincerely pious and respectable men.

---

[10] The existence of these *seven* keys is virtually admitted owing to deep research in the Egyptological lore, by Mr. G. Massey again. While opposing the teachings of *Esoteric Buddhism*—unfortunately misunderstood by him in almost every respect—in his Lecture on "The Seven Souls of Man," he writes (p. 21):—

"This system of thought, this mode of representation, this septenary of powers, in various aspects, had been established in Egypt, at least seven thousand years ago, as we learn from certain allusions to Atum (the god 'in whom the fatherhood was individualised as the *begetter of an eternal soul,*' the *seventh* principle of the Theosophists), found in the inscriptions lately discovered at Sakarah. I say in various aspects, *because the gnosis of the Mysteries was, at least, sevenfold in its nature*—it was Elemental, Biological, Elementary (human), Stellar, Lunar, Solar and Spiritual—and *nothing short of a grasp of the whole system can possibly enable us to discriminate the various parts, distinguish one from the other, and determine the which and the what, as we try to follow the symbolical Seven through their several phases of character.*"

* * * We may learn from the Gospel *according* to Luke, that the "worthy" were . . . initiated into the mysteries of the Gnosis. . . . In other words, they were the great adepts of *whatever religion;* and the words apply to all those who, without being Initiates, strive and succeed through personal efforts to *live the life* and to attain the naturally ensuing spiritual illumination in blending their personality—the ("Son") —with (the "Father"), their individual divine Spirit, *the God within* them. This "resurrection" can never be monopolized by the Christians, but is the spiritual birth-right of every human being endowed with soul and spirit, whatever his religion may be. Such individual is a *Christman.* On the other hand, those who choose to ignore the Christ (principle) within themselves, must die *unregenerate heathen*—baptism, sacraments, lip-prayers, and belief in dogmas notwithstanding. * * *

Now *Chrestos,* as already said, is a term applied in various senses. It qualifies both Deity and Man. It is used in the former sense in the Gospels, and in Luke (vi., 35), where it means "kind," and "merciful." On the other hand, it is explained by Clemens Alexandrinus as simply meaning a good man; i.e. "All who believe in *Chrest* (a good man) both *are,* and *are called Chrestians,* that is good men." (Strom. lib. ii.) The reticence of Clemens, whose Christianity, as King truly remarks in his *"Gnostics,"* was no more than a graft upon the congenial stock of his original Platonism, is quite natural. He was an Initiate, a new Platonist, before he became a Christian, which fact, however much he may have fallen off from his earlier views, could not exonerate him from his pledge of secrecy. And as a Theosophist and a *Gnostic,* one who *knew,* Clemens must have known that *Christos* was "the WAY," while *Chrestos* was the lonely traveller journeying on to reach the ultimate goal through that "Path," which was *Christos,* the glorified Spirit of "TRUTH," the reunion with which makes the soul (the Son) ONE with the (Father) Spirit. That Paul knew it, is certain, for his own expressions prove it. For what do the words . . . "I am again in travail *until Christ be formed in you*" mean, but what we give in its esoteric rendering, i.e., "until you find *the* Christos within yourselves as your only 'way'." (*vide* Galatians iv., 19 and 20.)

Thus Jesus, whether of Nazareth or Lüd,[11] was a Chrestos, as un-

[11] Or Lydda. Reference is made here to the Rabbinical tradition in the Babylonian Gemara, called *Sepher Toledoth Jeshu,* about Jesus being the son of one named Pandira, and having lived a century earlier than the era called Christian, namely, during the reign of the Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus and his wife Salome, who reigned from the year 106 to 79 B.C. Accused by the Jews of having learned the magic art in Egypt, and of having

deniably as that he never was entitled to the appellation of *Christos,* during his life-time and before his last trial. * * *

For, we say it again, the surname Christos is based on, and the story of the Crucifixion derived from, events that preceded it. Everywhere, in India as in Egypt, in Chaldea as in Greece, all these legends were built upon one and the same primitive type; the voluntary sacrifice of the *logoï*—the *rays* of the one LOGOS, the direct manifested emanation from the One ever-concealed Infinite and Unknown—whose *rays* incarnated in mankind. They consented to *fall into matter,* and are, therefore, called the "Fallen Ones." This is one of those great mysteries which can hardly be touched upon in a magazine article, but shall be noticed in a separate work of mine, *The Secret Doctrine,* very fully.

* * * *Kri,* in Sanskrit, the first syllable in the name of Krishna, meaning "to pour out, or rub over, to cover with,"[12] among many other things, this may lead one as easily to make of Krishna, "the anointed one." Christian philologists try to limit the meaning of Krishna's name to its derivation from *Krish,* "black"; but if the analogy and comparison of the Sanskrit with the Greek roots contained in the names of Chrestos, Christos, and Chrishna, are analyzed more carefully, it will be found that they are all of the same origin.[13] * * *

Yet none of these names can be unriddled, as some Orientalists imagine, merely with the help of astronomy and the knowledge of zodiacal signs in conjunction with phallic symbols. Because, while the sidereal symbols of the mystic characters or personifications in Puranas or Bible, fulfill astronomical functions, their spiritual ante-types rule invisibly, but very effectively, the world. They exist as abstractions on the higher plane, as manifested ideas on the astral, and become males, females and androgyne powers on this lower plane of ours. *Scorpio,* as *Chrestos-*

---

stolen from the Holy of Holies the Incommunicable Name, Jehoshua (Jesus) was put to death by the Sanhedrin at Lud. He was stoned and then crucified on a tree, on the eve of Passover. The narrative is ascribed to the Talmudistic authors of "Sota" and "Sanhedrin," p. 19, Book of Zechiel. See *Isis Unveiled,* II, 201; Arnobius; Eliphas Levi's *"Science des Esprits,"* and "The Historical Jesus and Mythical Christ," a lecture by G. Massey.

[12] Hence the memorialising of the doctrine during the MYSTERIES. The pure monad, the "god" incarnating and becoming *Chrestos,* or man, on his trial of life, a series of those trials led him to the *crucifixion of flesh,* and finally into the Christos condition.

[13] On the best authority the derivation of the Greek *Christos* is shown from the Sanskrit root *gharsh*—"rub"; thus: *gharsh-a-mi-to,* "to rub," and *gharsh-ta-s* "flayed, sore." Moreover, Krish, which means in one sense to plough and make furrows, means also to cause pain, "to torture, to torment," and *gharsh-ta-s* "rubbing"—all these terms relating to Chrestos and Christos conditions. One has *to die in Chrestos,* i.e., kill one's personality and its passions, to blot out every idea of separateness from one's "Father," the Divine Spirit in man; to become one with the eternal and absolute *Life* and *Light* (SAT) before one can reach the glorious state of *Christos,* the regenerated man, the man in spiritual freedom.

Meshiac, and Leo, as *Christos-Messiah,* antedated by far the Christian era in the trials and triumphs of Initiation during the Mysteries, Scorpio standing as symbol for the latter, Leo for the glorified triumph of the "sun" of truth.[14] * * *

* * * To the true follower of the SPIRIT OF TRUTH, it matters little, therefore, whether Jesus, as man and Chrestos, lived during the era called Christian, or before, or never lived at all. The Adepts, who lived and died for humanity, have existed in many and all the ages, and many were the good and holy men in antiquity who bore the surname or title of Chrestos before Jesus of Nazareth, otherwise Jesus (or Jehoshua) Ben Pandira was born. Therefore, one may be permitted to conclude, with good reason, that Jesus, or Jehoshua, was like Socrates, like Phocian, like Theodorus, and so many others surnamed *Chrestos,* i.e., the "good, the excellent," the gentle, and holy Initiate, who showed the "way" to the Christos condition, and thus became himself "the Way" in the hearts of his enthusiastic admirers. The Christians, as all the "Hero-worshippers," have tried to throw into the background all the other Chrestoï, who have appeared to them as rivals of *their* Man-God. But if the voice of the MYSTERIES has become silent for many ages in the West, if Eleusis, Memphis, Antium, Delphi, and Cresa have long ago been made the tombs of a Science once as colossal in the West as it is yet in the East, there are successors now being prepared for them. We are in 1887 and the nineteenth century is close to its death. The twentieth century has strange developments in store for humanity, and may even be the last of its name.

But I may briefly repeat a prophecy which is a self-evident result of the present state of men's minds in Christendom. Belief in the Bible

---

[14] The Orientalists and Theologians are invited to read over and study the allegory of Viswakarman, the "Omnificent," the Vedic God, the architect of the world, who sacrificed himself *to himself* or the world, after having offered up all worlds, *which are himself,* in a "Sarva Madha" (general sacrifice)—and ponder over it. In the Puranic allegory, his daughter *Yogasiddha* "Spiritual consciousness," the wife of *Surya,* the Sun, complains to him of the too great effulgence of her husband; and Viswakarma, in his character of *Takshaka,* "wood cutter and carpenter," placing the Sun upon his lathe, cuts away a part of his brightness. Surya looks, after this, crowned with dark thorns instead of rays, and becomes Vikarttana ("shorn of his rays"). All these names are terms which were used by the candidates when going through the trials of Initiation. The Hierophant-Initiator personated Viswakarman, the father, and the general *artificer* of the gods (the adepts on earth), and the candidate—Surya, the Sun, who had to kill all his fiery passions and wear the crown of thorns while *crucifying his body* before he could rise and be reborn into a new life as the glorified "Light of the World"—Christos. No Orientalist seems to have ever perceived the suggestive analogy, let alone to apply it!

literally, and in a *carnalised* Christ, will not last a quarter of a century longer. The Churches will have to part with their cherished dogmas, or the 20th century will witness the downfall and ruin of all Christendom, and with it, belief even in a Christos, as pure Spirit. The very name has now become obnoxious, and theological Christianity must die out, *never to resurrect again* in its present form. This, in itself, would be the happiest solution of all, were there no danger from the natural reaction which is sure to follow: crass materialism will be the consequence and the result of centuries of blind faith, unless the loss of old ideals is replaced by other ideals, unassailable, because *universal,* and built on the rock of eternal truths instead of the shifting sands of human fancy. Pure immateriality must replace, in the end, the terrible anthropomorphism of those ideals in the conceptions of our modern dogmatists. * * *

Study the Vedas; read even the superficial, often disfigured writings of our great Orientalists, and think over what you will have learnt. Behold Brahmans, Egyptian Hierophants, and Chaldean Magi, teaching several thousand years before our era that the gods themselves had been only mortals (in previous births) until they won their immortality by *offering their blood to their Supreme God* or chief. * * *

Whenever I hear the Vedic rites discussed and called "disgusting human sacrifices," and cannibalism (*sic.*), I feel always inclined to ask, where's the difference? Yet there is one, in fact; for while Christians are compelled to accept the allegorical (though, when understood, highly philosophical) drama of the New Testament Crucifixion, as that of Abraham and Isaac literally,[15] Brahmanism—its philosophical schools at any rate—teaches its adherents that this (*pagan*) sacrifice of the "primeval male" is a purely allegorical and philosophical symbol. * * *

The origin of all religions—Judaeo-Christianity included—is to be found in a few primeval truths, not one of which can be explained apart from all the others, as each is a complement of the rest in some one detail. And they are all, more or less, broken rays of the same Sun of truth, and their beginnings have to be sought in the archaic records of the Wisdom-religion. Without the light of the latter, the greatest

---

[15] *Vide* "The Soldier's Daughter," in this number [*Lucifer,* February, 1888], by the Rev. T. G. Headley, and notice the desperate protest of this *true* Christian, against the *literal* acceptance of the "blood sacrifices," "Atonement by blood," etc., in the Church of England. The reaction begins: another *sign of the times.*

scholars can see but the skeletons thereof covered with masks of fancy, and based mostly on personified Zodiacal signs.

A thick film of allegory and *blinds,* the "dark sayings" of fiction and parable, thus covers the original esoteric texts from which the New Testament—*as now known* —was compiled. Whence, then, the Gospels, the life of Jesus of Nazareth? Has it not been repeatedly stated that no human, *mortal* brain could have invented the life of the Jewish Reformer, followed by the awful drama on Calvary? We say, on the authority of the esoteric Eastern School, that all this came from the Gnostics, as far as the name Christos and the astronomico-mystical allegories are concerned, and from the writings of the ancient *Tanaïm* as regards the Kabalistic connection of Jesus or Joshua, with the Biblical personifications. One of these is the mystic esoteric name of Jehovah —not the present fanciful God of the profane Jews ignorant of their own mysteries, the God accepted by the still more ignorant Christians —but the compound Jehovah of the pagan Initiation. This is proven very plainly by the glyphs or mystic combinations of various signs which have survived to this day in the Roman Catholic hieroglyphics.

The Gnostic Records contained the epitome of the chief scenes enacted during the mysteries of Initiation, since the memory of man; though even that was given out invariably under the garb of semi-allegory, whenever entrusted to parchment or paper. But the ancient Tanaïm, the initiates from whom the wisdom of the Kabala (*oral tradition*) was obtained by the later Talmudists, had in their possession the secrets of the mystery language, and it is *in this language that the Gospels* were written. [16] He alone who has mastered the esoteric cypher of antiquity —the secret meaning of the numerals, a common property at one time of all nations—has the full proof of the genius which was displayed in the blending of the purely Egypto-Jewish, Old Testament allegories and names, and those of the pagan-Greek Gnostics, the most refined of all the mystics of that day. * * *

. . . the Christian application of the compound name Jesus-Christ is all based on Gnostic and Eastern mysticism. It was only right and natural that Chroniclers like the initiated Gnostics, pledged to secrecy, should veil or *cloak* the final meaning of their oldest and most sacred

---

[16] Thus while the three Synoptics display a combination of the pagan Greek and Jewish symbologies, the *Revelation* is written in the mystery language of the Tanaïm—the relic of Egyptian and Chaldean wisdom—and St. John's Gospel is purely Gnostic.

teachings. The right of the Church fathers to cover the whole with an epitheme of euhemerized fancy is rather more dubious.[17] The Gnostic Scribe and Chronicler deceived no one.

Every Initiate into the Archaic gnosis—whether of the pre-Christian or post-Christian period—knew well the value of every word of the "mystery-language." For these Gnostics—the inspirers of primitive Christianity—were "the most cultured, the most learned and most wealthy of the Christian name," as Gibbon has it. Neither they, nor their humbler followers, were in danger of accepting the dead letter of their own texts. But it was different with the victims of the fabricators of what is now called *orthodox* and *historic* Christianity. Their successors have all been made to fall into the mistakes of the "foolish Galatians" reproved by Paul, who, as he tells them (Galat. iii. 1-5), having begun (by believing) in the spirit (of Christos), "ended by believing in *the flesh,"—i.e.,* a *corporeal* Christ. * * *

Thus, what with several generations of most active Church Fathers ever working at the destruction of old documents and the preparation of new passages to be interpolated in those which happened to survive, there remains of the *Gnostics*—the legitimate offspring of the Archaic Wisdom-religion—but a few unrecognisable shreds. But a particle of genuine gold will glitter for ever; and, however garbled the accounts left by Tertullian and Epiphanius of the Doctrines of the "Heretics," an occultist can yet find even in them traces of those primeval truths which were once universally imparted during the mysteries of Initiation. Among other works with most suggestive allegories in them, we have still the so-called *Apocryphal Gospels,* and the last discovered as the most precious relic of Gnostic literature, a fragment called *Pistis-Sophia,* "Knowledge-Wisdom." * * *

---

[17] "The claim of Christianity to possess Divine authority rests on the ignorant belief that the mystical Christ could and did become a Person, whereas the gnosis proves the corporeal Christ to be only a counterfeit Presentment of the trans-corporeal man; consequently, historical portraiture is, and ever must be, a fatal mode of falsifying and discrediting the Spiritual Reality." (G. Massey, "Gnostic and Historic Christianity.")

OCCULTISM: WHAT IS IT?

NOT only in the Theosophical Society, but out of it, are tyros in Occultism. They are dabblers in a fine art, a mighty science, an almost impenetrable mystery. The motives that bring them to the study are as various as the number of individuals engaged in it, and as hidden from even themselves as is the center of the earth from the eye of science. Yet the *motive* is more important than any other factor.

These dilettanti in this science have always been abroad. No age or country has been without them, and they have left after them many books—of no particular value. Those of to-day are making them now, for the irresistible impulse of vanity drives them to collate the more or less unsound hypotheses of their predecessors, which, seasoned with a proper dash of mystery, are put forth to the crowd of those who would fain acquire wisdom at the cost-price of a book. Meanwhile the world of real occultists smiles silently, and goes on with the laborious process of sifting out the living germs from the masses of men. For occultists must be found and fostered and prepared for coming ages when power will be needed and pretension will go for nothing.

But the persons now writing about occultism and competent to do any more than repeat unproved formulae and assertions left over from mediaeval days, are few in number. It is very easy to construct a book full of so-called occultism taken from French or German books, and then to every now and then stop the reader short by telling him that it is not wise to reveal any more. The writings of Christian in France give much detail about initiations into occultism, but he honestly goes no further than to tell what he has gained from Greek and Latin fragments. Others, however, have followed him, repeated his words without credit, and as usual halted at the explanation.

There are, again, others who, while asserting that there is magic science called occultism, merely advise the student to cultivate purity and spiritual aspirations, leaving it to be assumed that powers and knowledge will follow. Between these two, Theosophists of the self-seeking or the unselfish type are completely puzzled. Those who are selfish may learn by bitter disappointment and sad experience; but the

---

NOTE.—This article by Mr. Judge was first published in the *Path*, May, 1890, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for March, 1947.

unselfish and the earnest need encouragement on the one hand and warning on the other. As an Adept wrote years ago to London Theosophists: "He who does not feel equal to the work need not undertake a task too heavy for him." This is applicable to all, for every one should be informed of the nature and heaviness of the task. Speaking of this tremendous thing—Occultism—Krishna in the *Bhagavad-Gita* says: "During a considerable period of time this doctrine has been lost in the world. . . . This mystery is very important." We do not think that the doctrine has yet been restored to the world, albeit that it is in the keeping of living men—the Adepts. And in warning those who strive after occultism with a selfish motive he declares: "Confused by many worldly thoughts, surrounded by the meshes of bewilderment, devoted to the enjoyment of their desires, they descend to foul Naraka . . . and hence they proceed to the lowest plane of being."

In what, then, does the heaviness of the Occultist's task consist? In the immensity of its sweep as well as the infinitude of its detail. Mere sweet and delightful longing after God will not of itself accomplish it, nor is progress found in *aspiring* to self-knowledge, even when as a result of that is found partial illumination. These are excellent; but we are talking of a problem whose implacable front yields to nothing but *force,* and that force must be directed by *knowledge.*

The field is not emotional, for the play of the emotions destroys the equilibrium essential to the art. Work done calling for reward avails not unless it has produced knowledge.

A few examples will show that in Occult Science there is a vastness and also a multiplicity of division not suspected by theosophical Occultists in embryo.

The element of which fire is a visible effect is full of centres of force. Each one is ruled by is own law. The aggregate of centres and the laws governing them which produce certain physical results are classed by science as laws in physics, and are absolutely ignored by the book-making Occultist because he has no knowledge of them. No dreamer or even a philanthropist will ever as such know those laws. And so on with all the other elements.

The Masters of Occultism state that a law of "transmutation among forces" prevails forever. It will baffle any one who has not the power to calculate the value of even the smallest tremble of a vibration, not only in itself but instantly upon its collision with another, whether that

other be similar to it or different. Modern science admits the existence of this law as the correlation of forces. It is felt in the moral sphere of our being as well as in the physical world, and causes remarkable changes in a man's character and circumstances quite beyond us at present and altogether unknown to science and metaphysics.

It is said that each person has a distinct mathematical value expressed by one number. This is a compound or resultant of numberless smaller values. When it is known, extraordinary effects may be produced not only in the mind of the person but also in his feelings, and this number may be discovered by certain calculations more recondite than those of our higher mathematics. By its use the person may be made angry without cause, and even insane or full of happiness, just as the operator desires.

There is a world of beings known to the Indians as that of the Devas, whose inhabitants can produce illusions of a character the description of which would throw our wildest romances into the shade. They may last five minutes and seem as a thousand years, or they may extend over ten thousand actual years.

Into this world the purest theosophist, the most spiritual man or woman, may go without consent, unless the knowledge and power are possessed which prevent it.

On the threshold of all these laws and states of being linger forces and beings of an awful and determined character. No one can avoid them, as they are on the road that leads to knowledge, and they are every now and then awakened or perceived by those who, while completely ignorant on these subjects, still persist in dabbling with charms and necromantic practices.

It is wiser for theosophists to study the doctrine of brotherhood and its application, to purify their motives and actions, so that after patient work for many lives, if necessary, in the great cause of humanity, they may at last reach that point where all knowledge and all power will be theirs by right.

—EUSEBIO URBAN

QUESTION—AND COMMENT

THERE are many occasions for questioning what seems the Theosophical student's "ambivalence" in relation to the various religious traditions. For example, H. P. Blavatsky, in Isis Unveiled, *excoriates much of conventional Christianity and in particular attacks the psychology of Roman Catholicism. On the other hand, she often observes that there are significant connectives between Theosophy and* every *religious tradition. In the closing sentence of the ULT Declaration one notes the emphasized sentence, "The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all." Now, it is very easy for the Theosophist to feel oppositional toward conventional religions—and also easy to forget that one of the main themes of* The Secret Doctrine *is that, within each religion, there is some essence of inspiration which relates to Theosophy. This question has been discussed, of course, a number of times in classes and in articles in* THEOSOPHY, *but it suddenly appears to this student that the discussion will never be complete enough, and that it should be extended whenever possible.*

This comment introduces, or rather renews, a question so basic to the understanding of the meaning of Theosophy that even the most inept approach to "continuing the discussion" must have a value. One point of departure which suggests itself is intimated by William Q. Judge in his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* and while it is most common for students to assume that Mr. Judge's essays on the *Gita* pertain to this particular scripture alone, another way of reading what is said indicates that, through the medium of discussion of the *Gita,* Mr. Judge is talking about all religions—a kinship with and also a paralleling theosophical separation from the beliefs and ceremonies of all "cult and sect" psychology. The clue, we think, is furnished by the repetitive allusion in the *Gita Notes* to the psychology of "initiation."

In his commentaries upon Chapter II of the *Gita,* Mr. Judge speaks of "a system of initiation which is the mother of all others"; all the rest are mere exoteric copies or perversions of the real. In various passages it becomes clear that Mr. Judge is saying that every human being who aspires towards a higher life, or to an idealization of morality, is concerned with the subject of initiation. "*All* human beings," he says, "are working through this system of initiation," and continues:

> None of us, and especially those who have heard of the Path or of Occultism or of the Masters, can say with confidence that he is not already one who has passed through some initiations with knowledge of them. We may be already initiated into some higher degree than our present attainments would suggest, and are undergoing a new trial unknown to ourselves. It is better to consider that we are, being sure to eliminate all pride of that unknown advance we have made. Having so concluded, we know that this long life is in itself another initiation, wherein we succeed or fail just as we learn the lesson of life.

The "Secret Doctrine" that is within or behind every religious belief, sacrament, and ceremony lies in the simple teaching of *self*-initiation or self-discovery. From Egyptian tradition and from the tradition of the Greek Mystery Schools we have many examples of formal initiatory processes—those involved with rituals. But the Theosophist is one who at least *begins* to see that no "system" is the equivalent of those "leaps into the void" which each one must encounter in his own way.

Perhaps the essential Theosophical quarrel with the influence of Roman Catholicism does not so much lie in Catholic disapproval of Theosophical doctrine—in expected partisan alignment of forces in opposition: The point of *psychological* departure derives from recognition that in Roman Catholicism one encounters the strongest embodiment of a system which insists upon *formalizing* initiation—and, furthermore, restricts the idea of initiatory progression to the priest—who may of course become a bishop, an archbishop, or even a pope.

True initiations are esoteric, not exoteric, and this is what Mr. Judge is pointing out when explaining why Krishna must admonish Arjuna to forget the Vedic formalizations of spiritual progress. A key paragraph appears in a further commentary of Mr. Judge's on Chapter II of the *Gita*:

> The essence of the instruction given by Krishna is by showing how erroneous it was to follow even the special ceremonies and texts laid down for the people in the Vedas. Those ceremonies procured either rewards in heaven, or upon the earth during subsequent lives as well as in those in which the ceremonies were performed. We can more easily understand what Krishna meant if we will suppose him to be referring to a doctrine that in those days was precisely similar in its scheme of rewards to the old-fashioned Christian belief that, by following the Scriptures, one secured happiness and prosperity on earth and great bliss forever in heaven with the saints. This is declared by him to be a deluding doctrine.

The Theosophist, if he is a student in the sense implied by Mr. Judge, must recognize that he participates to a degree in both the essential traditions of religion—the one having to do with reliance upon beliefs and doctrines, the other a perception of the need for penetrating beyond such reliance. He must, periodically, recognize that his desire for enlightenment will precipitate him into what Judge calls "the great abyss." And when one finds himself in an "abyss" there are not, nor can there ever be, rules and regulations, proscribings and pronouncements that will automatically take him out of it. *He* must find the way himself, discover the doctrine which is "secret" because no one can reveal it to him except himself. The Theosophist, then, in Mr. Judge's terms, can never deride the devotion of any sectarian who follows his own particular tradition —for each one of these describes some method of progress: "The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all."

The "true Theosophist" embodies humility, not so much because he focuses upon his own obvious imperfections, but rather because he sees every man, sectarian or not, as Arjuna, and identifies with Arjuna through recognition of a universal susceptibility to forms, ceremonies, and rituals—as well as to the voice of Krishna. This is one way—and perhaps the most important way—of recognizing the identity of all human beings in terms of an evolutionary struggle—the struggle that is epitomized in the Third Fundamental Proposition of H.P.B.'s *Secret Doctrine* when she says that the pivotal doctrine of the esoteric philosophy teaches the acquirement of individuality through self-induced efforts. Yet an essential derivation from a study of Mr. Judge's many references to the universal processes of "initiation" is that none of us may be presently able to do without the equivalent of the "Vedas"—without some variety of ritual or doctrine. If we *were* able to, we would be Adepts or Mahatmas.

The only difference between the aspiring Theosophist and the devotee of any formal religious tradition is that the Theosophist is invited to see *why* it is that he must periodically become the "hero" who steps into the abyss—because he knows the ultimate necessity of reaching what lies beyond. The Buddha taught his disciples no way of salvation, but instructed them in the necessity of periodically gaining the courage to travel "upstream" against all the tides of the psychic nature—and he also warned them that whenever such an attempt was made they would have to live and breathe in an element temporarily foreign to them.

PROEM

VII

DIFFERENTIATION is an initiating act, a process of action, and the characteristic difference developed as result of the action. The idea of "differentiation" is universal in application and in implication. "All manifested objects, beings, or powers are only differentiations of the Great Unknown," said Wm. Q. Judge in *The Ocean of Theosophy.*

We are mainly—for various reasons—engrossed in the *result* of action, often oblivious of, or unconcerned with, the *process* leading to its culmination, and we are seldom if ever aware of the moment or point of *initiation* of an act. We move with a false sense of security in the "changing" world. We observe mutely, with senses half-awake, the compelling movements of the Universe within and about us. And we are totally unaware of the Reality which lies at the Root of all movement, except as the inner eye—the intuition—awakes, and who can say by what means? An attitude of *detachment?* An *impersonal* desire to know—result, perhaps, of selfless efforts in prior lives of the reincarnating Ego.

Differentiation begins with MOTION. In the abstract sense, MOTION represents Unconditioned Consciousness. The ceaselessness of Motion —identified with the boundlessness of Space—is symbolized by the GREAT BREATH. Nearing the level of philosophical comprehension—in the stage depicted in the Third Stanza from the Book of Dzyan—Motion is presented as the "Root of Life":

> The Root of Iife was in every drop of the Ocean of Immortality [Amrita], and the Ocean was Radiant Light, which was Fire and Heat and Motion.

The fire, heat, and motion here spoken of are not the "fire, heat, and motion of physical science, but the underlying abstractions, the noumena, or the soul, of the essence of these material manifestations."

Differentiation is introduced in the Proem to *The Secret Doctrine* linked with a word that suggests beginning, expansion, and promise of fulfilment—"the dawn of differentiation." This facet of meaning of the deeply-occult Point-symbol has dual significance: the beginning *in Time* of a period of Activity following a period of Rest (Pralaya), and the unfolding *in Space* of latent potentialities—"the periodical manifesta-

tions of the ever-eternal nature." How this symbol bridges the *pre*-Dawn and the manifesting Universe is indicated by H.P.B. (*S.D.* I, 327-8):

> It (the Unknown. . .) is represented by a boundless darkness, on the ground of which appears the first central point in white—thus symbolizing coeval and co-eternal SPIRIT-MATTER making its first appearance in the phenomenal world, before its first differentiation. When "the one becomes two," it may then be referred to as Spirit *and* Matter.

Spirit and Matter are not "independent realities"—are never separable. H.P.B. quotes from a *Commentary* (*S.D.* I, 258):

> Whatsoever quits the Laya State, becomes active life; it is drawn into the vortex of MOTION (the alchemical solvent of Life); Spirit and Matter are the two States of the ONE, which is neither Spirit nor Matter, both being the absolute life, latent. . . . Spirit is the first differentiation of (and in) SPACE; and Matter the first differentiation of Spirit. That, which is neither Spirit nor Matter—that is IT—the Causeless CAUSE of Spirit and Matter, which are the Cause of Kosmos. And THAT we call the ONE LIFE or the Intra-Cosmic Breath.

And in *The Tao Te King,* Lao Tze says: "There is something, chaotic yet complete, which existed before Heaven and Earth." He calls it TAO, and speaks of its transcendental aspect and its physical manifestation: "The Tao which can be expressed in words is not the eternal Tao; the name which can be uttered is not its eternal name. Without a name, it is the beginning of Heaven and Earth; with a name it is the Mother of all things. Only one who is eternally free from earthly passions can apprehend its spiritual essence; he who is ever clogged by passions can see no more than its outer form. These two things, the spiritual and the material, though we call them by different names, in their origin are one and the same. This sameness is a mystery—the mystery of mysteries. It is the gate of all spirituality."

Subtly underlying the idea of differentiation is the concept of equilibrium. The word "equilibrium" (Lat. *æquus,* equal, and *libra,* a balance) means a condition of equal balance between opposite or counteracting forces. *Equilibrium* has a range of application, and means in particular a tendency to return to the original position after a disturbance. This "tendency to return" suggests the basic cyclic pattern everywhere observable. The disturbance of equilibrium is familiarly illustrated by dropping a pebble into a pool of water: the water set into cyclic movement returns after a time to a state of quiet, or rest—the "inactive" state.

Another type of "tendency to return" finds illustration in the unfolded potentialities of the seed: the acorn's potentialities produce the oak tree which returns fruitage of acorns with latent potentialities. Again, the tendency of the mind to "return to that which is pleasant, or to that which is unpleasant." And in the Upanishadic tale, the sage Yajnavalkya says of the Spirit of man: "With the Soul as his light he rests, goes forth, does his work, and returns."

Activity and Rest alternate ceaselessly. "Even cosmic matter, indestructible though it be in its essence, must have a time of rest, and return to its Layam state." *Layam* or *Laya* (Sans. root *Li* "to dissolve, to disintegrate") is a point of equilibrium in physics and chemistry. In occultism, it is that point where substance becomes homogeneous. It is a condition. The *laya* state is "the eternal and *normal* condition of substance, which differentiates only periodically, and is during that differentiation in an *abnormal* state—in other words, a transitory illusion of the senses": from homogeneity, differentiation, heterogeneity, dissolution, to re-absorption or rest in the state of *laya* or absolute equilibrium.

The "imperishable Laya centers" have a great importance and their meaning must be fully understood if we would have a clear conception of the Archaic Cosmogony, whose theories have passed into Occultism, says H.P.B. By the law of analogy, the *laya* state must have "importance and meaning" in the life of man, and the elucidation of a "neutral centre" (*S.D.* I, 148) is suggestive and significant:

> A "neutral centre" is, in one aspect, the limiting point of any given set of senses. Thus, imagine two consecutive planes of matter as already formed; each of these corresponding to an appropriate set of perceptive organs. We are forced to admit that between these two planes of matter an incessant circulation takes place; and if we follow the atoms and molecules of (say) the lower in their transformation upwards, these will come to a point where they pass altogether beyond the range of the faculties we are using on the lower plane. In fact, to us the matter of the lower plane there vanishes from our perception into nothing—or rather it passes on to the higher plane, and the state of matter corresponding to such a point of transition must certainly possess special and not readily discoverable properties.

Matter in its homogeneous state is never wholly absent, for Spirit and Matter are never separate. "Primeval matter—*i.e.* as it *appeared even in its first* differentiation from its *laya* condition—is yet to this day homogeneous, at immense distances, in the depths of infinitude, and

likewise at points not far removed from the outskirts of our solar system." The seemingly remote Cosmic processes are intimate and inevitable. The *laya*-equilibrium disturbed, matter is in the state of Alaya —a name for the Universal Soul. *The Voice of the Silence* says:

> Alas, alas, that all men should possess Alaya, be one with the Great Soul, and that possessing it, Alaya should so little avail them!
>
> Behold how like the moon, reflected in the tranquil waves, Alaya is reflected by the small and by the great, is mirrored in the tiniest atoms, yet fails to reach the heart of all. Alas, that so few men should profit by the gift, the priceless boon of learning truth, the right perception of existing things, the knowledge of the non-existent!

This fundamental *identity* of all souls with the Universal Soul has its relevant and practical application in Wm. Q. Judge's counsel that, "in the spreading of the doctrines of Universal Brotherhood, the truth in all things may be discovered." And again: "In the Spirit or Atma *all* experiences of *all* forms of life and death are found at once, and he who is one with the Atma knows the whole manifested Universe at once." *The Secret Doctrine* explains that Alaya is "both the Universal Soul and the Self of a progressed adept."

Matter is the "self-existing basis whose septenary manvantaric differentiations constitute the objective reality underlying the phenomena of each phase of conscious existence." Differentiation of matter is the "conditioning" of Consciousness, or Spirit. Every thought, every feeling, every choice modifies, qualifies, transforms the *material* environment: bodily, intellectual, psychic and spiritual. Ideals or hopes are cause of conditioning as well as distrust or despair. The Consciousness moves through the states of waking, dreaming and sleep, and experiences in the "ethereal vesture" of the Devachanic state. *The Bhagavad-Gita* says of Purusha, the spirit, and Prakriti, matter or nature: "Spirit when invested with matter or *prakriti* experienceth the qualities which proceed from *prakriti*. . . ."

Manifestation is *rooted* in mystery, and the word "manifest" appears contradictory in its ascribed meaning. *Manifest* has various derivations which mean, generally, "clear, open to view," "evident to the senses, esp. to the sight; hence obvious to the understanding; not obscure." The field and function of mind is understanding, but what do the senses convey—dealing, as they do, with illusive or Mayavic appearances? The very profusion and diversity of Nature's phenomena may "ob-

scure"—may dull the senses and overawe the mind, may tend to unquestioning acceptance of the "wonders of God's creation," and pious acquiescence to "God's will."

What assurance then of understanding? The unfailing *recurrence* of Nature's phenomena must at last awaken the mind to recognition of a Law at work—the One LAW of the Universe which "acts on every planet through minor and varying laws." Perception of Law *throughout* Nature's manifestations is the first step to awareness of *continuity*—the Ariadne's thread that leads to *knowledge* of Law, and its conscious embodiment.

The Voice of the Silence counsels:

> Help Nature and work on with her; and Nature will regard thee as one of her creators and make obeisance.
>
> And she will open wide before thee the portals of her secret chambers, lay bare before thy gaze the treasures hidden in the very depths of her virgin bosom. Unsullied by the hand of Matter, she shows her treasures only to the eye of Spirit—the eye that never closes, the eye for which there is no veil in all her kingdoms.

How can one "help" without knowing the *nature* of Nature? Of the ONE LIFE—not as an aggregation, but as an indivisible *Unity?* Aggregation and dispersion or dissolution are modes of process and do not alter the underlying *continuity* of Life. Every atom is instinct with life. "Atoms are called 'vibrations' in Occultism; also Sound—collectively. Atoms fill the immensity of Space, and by their continuous vibration *are* that MOTION which keeps the wheels of Life perpetually going."

We, literally, "live and move and have our being" in a sea of change: the incessant change of forms—instability, and the as-constant change of growth and development—mutability. There is danger of being "engulfed" through identification with or attachment for the environing conditions. The *Voice* says: "Both action and inaction may find room in thee; thy body agitated, thy mind tranquil, thy Soul as limpid as a mountain lake."

. . . . .

> Of teachers there are many; the MASTER-SOUL is one, Alaya, the Universal Soul. Live in that MASTER as ITS ray in thee. Live in thy fellows as they live in IT. (*The Voice of the Silence*)

MISUNDERSTOOD BIBLICAL TRADITIONS

(*Concluded.*)

PRAYER

THERE is probably not a belief or practice in any of the world's creeds, however strange or even ridiculous it may appear, but has an element of truth at its core. And prayer evidently is no exception. What, then, may be the truth behind this ancient custom? Why has it persisted, in one form or another, throughout the ages? Is prayer only another name for meditation?

In its broadest definition, prayer may be thought of as a yearning, an ardent aspiration within the heart of man, to establish relationship with the *Whole,* of which he feels himself to be an indivisible part. It is an urge to transcend personal limitations, to *become* one's larger Self, and the urge takes many and various forms, according to the character, knowledge and wisdom of the aspirant.

Prayer, according to H. P. Blavatsky, has several meanings other than that given it by the Christians. It means not only a pleading or *petition,* but meant, in days of old, far more an invocation and incantation. It is a mystery rather; an occult process by which finite and conditioned thoughts and desires, unable to be assimilated by the absolute spirit which is unconditioned, are translated into spiritual wills and the will; such process being called "spiritual transmutation." The intensity of our ardent aspirations changes prayer into the "philosopher's stone," or that which transmutes lead into pure gold. The only homogeneous essence, our "will-prayer," becomes the active or creative force, producing effects according to our desire . . . prayer is an occult process bringing about physical results . . . *Will-Power* becomes a living power. But woe unto those would-be Occultists who, instead of crushing out the desires of the lower personal *ego* or physical man and saying, addressing their *Higher* Spiritual Ego immersed in Atma-Buddhic light, "Thy will be done, not mine," etc., send up waves of will-power for selfish or unholy purposes! For this is black magic, abomination, and spiritual sorcery. The only God we must recognize and pray to, or rather act in unison with, is that spirit of God of which our body is the temple, and in which it dwelleth. "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. 3: 16.)

Prayer, then, if it is any good at all, is an *invocation* of the powers and potentialities of the Divine Spirit. Whether its rationale is understood or not, the invocation, if successful, calls down upon the natures of all those who participate, both upon the one who speaks (in the case of public prayer) and upon those who listen, the fructifying rays of the Central Spiritual Sun, or God. Have we considered what they may mean? Have we forgotten the old adage, found in one form or another in every religious scripture worthy of the name, that "God is no respecter of persons?"

Sunlight is power—pure, impersonal, omnipotent—and so is God-light. The forces of Spirit—whether those emanating from the physical solar orb in the sky, or from the Central Spiritual Sun in heaven, which is God—can as readily kill as cure. Foolish is the man who places himself and others indiscriminately under its colorless though powerful rays. When the farmer prays for rain, he is not foolish enough to suppose (even if he thinks he will get it) that it will fall only upon *his* land and not upon his neighbor's, however uncooperative or even wicked the neighbor may be. When he prays for good weather, he does not expect the impartial rays of the Sun to nourish only the corn in his field and not the weeds. What reason, then, has the conductor of group prayer to believe that he can call forth the rays of Divine Light *only upon the good* which is resident in the hearts and minds of all those present, and not upon the evil?

One reason, perhaps, why public prayer is not advocated in the Gospels is that the ordinary praying man is not wise enough to discern what lies latent in the minds and hearts of all those who participate. And if these hidden potentialities cannot be known, how can one afford to take upon one's self the responsibility for their intensification? Just as the rays of the morning sun cause to grow every seed, whether useful or poisonous, that lies waiting in the earth, so the rays of a "Divine Light," invoked through prayer, intensify and cause to grow all desires, loves, hates, ambitions and jealousies. Jesus evidently was not willing to assume responsibility of this kind, which, in all probability, was the reason he "went off to himself" to pray.

If one would know the part played by *desire* in prayer, let him read and try to understand Mark 11: 24-26, where it is stated that "what things soever ye *desire,* believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." The Master does not say, note well, that one will receive *only the good*

things he desires, but "what things soever"—be they good or bad! That such is the correct interpretation, Jesus straightway, in the next verse, warns that while praying one must forget all personal desires and antipathies, must stand interiorly in a forgiving attitude of mind, otherwise the Father in heaven will not forgive him. "And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses." What can this mean but that the power of the Creative Spirit, flowing down through the *matrix of desire,* will bring to pass in due time every good or evil thing thus envisioned? The Theosophist, supported by the words of Jesus, insists upon the dangers of prayer—especially during *Kali Yuga,* when selfish thought and desire are the ruling characteristics of the age. If there is any truthful or logical way for the Christian to refute this position, the Theosophist would like to be shown it. Indeed, the theosophist holds that whenever a professed Christian denies that there is any danger in prayer he thereby sets up his judgment against that of Jesus, who must have known more about the matter than those who follow him. *Desire* is one of the most potent forces in the universe. Intensified by the power of the Spirit within, its potentialities for both good and evil are almost unlimited.

The pure man may conceivably offer up daily prayers for the whole of his lifetime, and experience therefrom nothing but apparent good—at least so long as his purity remains. But how many individuals, in this age of trial and difficulty, can be certain of their future moral equanimity? Where is the man or woman whose virtues have *all* been put to test? Is the average man strong enough and philosophical enough, when strained relations arise, to soar interiorly above his troubled heart, and to view the situation impersonally—with no feeling whatsoever of resentment? If this can be done, then he may succeed in escaping the danger aspect of prayer indefinitely. But woe to the praying individual who wishes another man ill, who says *Amen* to even an unexpressed feeling of revenge! For such is one of the most terrible of karmic sins, the consequences of which are sooner or later tragic. Unless a person can say "Thy will be done" *and mean it,* from the very depths of his heart, he had better leave prayer alone.

Also, one of the greatest dangers attendant upon prayer—not even suspected, perhaps, by those ignorant of the laws of the occult universe

—is the power resident in the spoken word. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," said St. John. "The Word (Verbum) or the speech of every man is, quite unconsciously to himself, a BLESSING or a CURSE"—certain words, according to the letters which compose them, possessing the most occult and formidable potencies. Students of this day, Christian or otherwise, seem to have little conception of the potentiality locked up in *words,* and in names.

Not only did Jesus refrain from praying before the multitudes, but in no single instance, at any place in the new Testament, did he pronounce the word *Amen.*[1] Why did he not use this word? Might it have been because *Amen,* like other ancient terms of mantramic quality, was held to be in occult correspondence with dynamic powers and potencies of the spiritual world? These forces, once awakened, were almost infinite in their potentialities. The Adepts of all ages have warned their disciples against pronouncing such words indiscriminately, especially when angry or after a fit of temper, lest they endanger not only their own lives but the lives of those they love.

Neither Buddha nor the Masters of Wisdom, from whom the present-day teachings of Theosophy emanated, advocated prayer of any kind for the masses. One reason for this position may be found in the view expressed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Key to Theosophy*: that prayer as commonly understood and practiced "kills self-reliance." In all too many instances, prayer is instigated by the desire to escape responsibility, by the unwillingness on the part of individuals to face up to and resolve their difficulties. It is likely to be colored by the hope or "expectation" that a *miracle* of some sort may happen, thus releasing us from our problems—the intent being, of course, that we may then be free to pursue our old mistaken courses without obstruction from the Law and without the necessary adjustments, on our own part, which the Law almost invariably decrees. Some of the motivating elements which usually attend prayer may be detected in the case, known to the writer, of a good and otherwise intelligent Christian who, as cashier of a small-town bank, attempted to resolve through this means a financial crisis through which the bank happened to be passing. God knew, he said, the bank's need for cash, if disaster was to be averted. He, as the responsible head,

---

[1] In the King James Version of the New Testament Jesus is quoted as saying *Amen* on two occasions (Matt. 6:13; 28:30), but in the Revised Standard Version (1953 ed.) this use was ruled out by the editors, after comparison with all ancient sources, as unauthentic.

had done all that he could by way of prayer. Needless to say, the crisis ended only when this individual energized himself from within and mustered the courage necessary for facing his creditors in an honest, more manly spirit. "What men usually ask for when they pray to God," according to an old European proverb, "is that two and two may not make four."

Prayer is many things to many people. To the initiated Chela or disciple, it is synonymous, perhaps, with the *Samadhi* of the Hindus and Buddhists—the road *par excellence* to union with the Divine Spirit, or God. To the good and pure man, of whatever faith, it may become a source of *psychic* balm and upliftment. For the vast majority, it may be only the feeling that we have been benefitted by the practice. It is so easy to say that things *probably* would not have turned out so well but for faithfulness in the daily ritual. Yet in how many instances has prayer to an outside, personal God been the chief cause for loss of self-reliance? And where lies the responsibility for those millions of former sincere Christians who, failing to obtain the help they sought in prayer, have turned their backs on religion as a whole, declaring it to be a waste of time? Is it possible, as suggested by H. P. Blavatsky, that the *atheist* is the bastard child of the church?

Theosophy has no dogma on prayer or on anything else. Theosophy, in fact, is not a system of dogmas, but of *principles*—and proceeding on the basis of principles, it holds that each individual owes it to his fellow men and to himself to become enlightened on subjects of common interest. Study of the sayings and practices of Jesus would seem to indicate that prayer, for the early Christian, had more than one meaning. Like meditation, it seems to have been of two sorts—*first,* that prayer or meditation practiced at a set time, or an occasional one; and *second,* that of an entire lifetime, that single thread of intention, intentness, and desire running through the years stretching between the cradle and the grave. Of this second sort, both Jesus and St. Paul speak. "Watch ye therefore and *pray always.*" (Luke 21:36.) "Pray without ceasing," said St. Paul in a letter to Timothy. (1 Tim. 4:5.) This latter, thread of lifetime aspiration, of devotion to an ideal, is the only form of prayer, according to Theosophy, that may be pursued by all men with both benefit and safety.

It was the view of the Founders of the present Theosophical Movement that *prayer,* as a particular rite or appeal, ought to be abandoned,

and replaced by self-induced and self-devised exertions. Man's spiritual intuitions, if only they could be heard through the deafening roar of custom and tradition, would probably assure him that work, duty, and common sense are the highest form of prayer for the average man, and that morality and right living need no artificial aids. The ethics given by Jesus on the Mount, together with a knowledge of Karma and Reincarnation, provide all that is needed by way of moral and religious instruction for the masses of aspiring men. These verities, said H. P. Blavatsky, are pure Theosophy, the teaching and discipline of the Wisdom Religion from time immemorial. If studied and applied, they will lead to the highest goal. Buddha spent the whole of his lifetime teaching the majesty of this Law of Love and Righteousness. It is the same Law of sowing-and-reaping taught and exemplified by all the great religious founders—that Law to which each one must answer, as St. Matthew says, for every word and thought, and from which none can escape either by prayer or favor or force or any other intermediary.

It seems clear from the foregoing that what Jesus meant by "prayer" was actually a communing with the Higher Self, an attempt to reach union with the "Father which is in heaven." There is no evidence that Jesus recommended the supplicatory prayer now customary "in His name." Buddha went even further, it seems, and overtly condemned this type of prayer. As poetically expressed by Sir Edwin Arnold in *The Light of Asia,* Buddha said:

> Pray not! the darkness will not brighten! Ask
> Nought from the Silence, for it cannot speak!
> Vex not your mournful minds with pious pains!
> Ah! Brothers, Sisters seek
> Nought from the helpless gods by gift and hymn,
> Nor bribe with blood, nor feed with fruit and cakes!
> Within yourselves deliverance must be sought;
> Each man his prison makes.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

THE usual distinction drawn between man and the animals is that man has a "self-conscious mind," whereas other creatures do not. From another point of view, perhaps an equally great distinction lies in the fact that animals can participate fully in each moment of life, can always experience the world in the present tense—whereas man is alienated from nature by his dissecting intellect, and so, often obscures the present moment in his memories of the past and musings about the future. Is there any way man can live in constant communion with the flow of life at a higher level, or must he ever remain the observer?

Being surrounded by man-made "objects," as most of us are, it is easy to despair and feel alienated from any sense of ultimate communion with nature: even in the country we often cannot help feeling that every flower is enigmatic, every simple stone an insoluble dilemma. What makes it even worse is the knowledge that the most beautiful, and to our eyes *precious,* of all these forms (whether that of a buttercup or that of a human being) can offer us their particular enigmas only once. Knowledge of death adds poignancy to ignorance. Rilke portrays this feeling with heart-rending accuracy:

> . . . the beast is free
> and has its death always behind it and God before it,
> and when it walks it goes toward eternity,
> as springs flow. Never, not for a single day
> do we have pure space before us in which the flowers
> are always unfolding. . . .
> Lovers, were it not for the other who blocks the view,
> are close to it and marvel. . . .
> Who has twisted us like this, so that—
> no matter what we do—we have the bearing
> of a man going away? As on the last hill
> that shows him all his valley, for the last time,
> he turns, stands still, and lingers, so we live,
> forever saying farewell.

Surely, though, we are not to conclude that it is better to be animals than men. The psychic plane, through which the animals view the world, is a realm of thoughtlessness and Edenic innocence, whereas

what man, at his best, desires is to enter into *conscious* communion with the essence of life. To do this he must not live below the level of intellect, but must transcend it, and the means for effecting the transcendence according to Theosophy, lie in the mind itself. In short, it is necessary to reach self-consciousness before one can hope to attain to a universal consciousness. Yet there is far more to self-consciousness than mere intellect. True, we have to grasp mentally the concepts exemplified in nature's processes; we have to see analogies and form speculations. But we can do more; we can exert our Will to turn the intellect upward toward the realm of Soul knowledge; we must try to feel as well as see; we must learn to love.

Only then can we see behind the forms we now cling to so desperately; only then will the myriad enigmas of life become myriad facets of our expanding consciousness. One who has reached a certain stage in this process of spiritual evolution "can direct his mind to a piece of stone, whether at a distance or near by, or to a man or class of men, and by means of concentration, cognize all the inherent qualities . . . and know all about the subject" (Preface to *Patanjali,* p. xvii). Such powers, however, do not represent an extension of scientific objectivity. Rather, they represent a new and greater intimacy with nature, an end to the obstructive aspects of self-awareness, an end to alienation. A short sentence on page 61 of *Patanjali* summarizes the essential aspects of this transformation, and indicates the resulting effect for the soul: "When the mind no longer conceives itself to be the knower, or experiencer, and has become one with the soul—the real knower and experiencer—Isolation takes place and the soul is emancipated." This isolation is paradoxically the essential condition for true, spiritual involvement; it is the drawing together of all the faculties in the service of the Self, the soul-centering of our powers, and the final disentanglement from the muddle of cross-purposes which till now has been the chief cause of our feelings of estrangement from nature.

A FEW QUESTIONS ON KARMA

STUDENTS find "Karma" everywhere and in everything associated with theosophical researches. There are times when its ramifications threaten to do away altogether with synthesis. What is a simple, practical definition?

Karma is that Law of readjustment which ever tends to restore disturbed equilibrium in the physical world, and broken harmony in the moral. In other words, physically it is action; metaphysically, the Law of Retribution, the Law of cause and effect or Ethical Causation.

Can it be said why harmony and justice stand equated in all these considerations?

Harmony in the physical and mathematical worlds of sense, is justice in the spiritual one. Justice produces harmony, and injustice, discord; and discord, on a cosmical scale, means chaos—annihilation.

What would be a less than cosmic illustration of such "inharmonic injustice"?

If there is a developed immortal spirit in man, it must be in everything else, at least in a latent or germinal state, and it can only be a question of time for each of these germs to become fully developed. What gross injustice it would be for an impenitent criminal man, the perpetrator of a brutal murder when in the exercise of his free will, to have an immortal spirit which in time may be washed clean of sin, and enjoy perfect happiness, while a poor horse, innocent of all crime, should toil and suffer under the merciless torture of his master's whip during a whole life, and then be annihilated at death. Such a belief implies a brutal sense of injustice, and is only possible among people taught in the dogma that everything is created for man, and he alone is the sovereign of the universe—a sovereign so mighty that to save him from the consequences of his own misdeeds, it was not too much that the God of the universe should die to placate his own just wrath!

The point is plain enough. But are there not many people who believe their sins can be washed away in "Purgatory"?

Evil deeds committed here on the objective plane could not with any scientific or moral propriety be punished on a plane which is purely subjective.

NOTE.—Answers collated from standard Theosophical sources.

We read: "There is design in the action of the seemingly blindest forces." Is "design" an attribute in the sway of Karma?

Karma neither punishes nor rewards, it is simply the one universal Law which guides unerringly and, so to say, blindly, all other laws productive of certain effects along the grooves of their respective causations.

But it is taught that Nemesis pursues the evil-doer to the bitter end, is it not?

Nemesis only in one sense, that of bad Karma. There is the Karma of merit and the Karma of demerit.

In spite of all the force and logic of ancient wisdom, are there not some hundreds of millions of Occidentals who still prefer taking their chances with, or placing their hopes of salvation and future life upon, the pronouncements of the Vicars of our Western Churches?

Hitherto the world has received nothing but sophistry—believed on *blind* faith. We ask palpable, tangible evidence of their God's justice and mercy. But all are silent; no answer, no reply, and still the inexorable unerring Law of Compensation proceeds on its unswerving path. If we but watch its progress, we will find that it ignores all creeds, shows no preferences, but its sunlight and its thunderbolts fall alike on heathen and Christian. No absolution can shield the latter when guilty, no anathema hurt the former when innocent.

What do you mean by "universal Law guiding unerringly all other laws"?

Karma is the ultimate Law of the Universe; the source, the origin, and fount of all other laws which exist throughout Nature.

Is Karma the same as "Deity" or the Creative Logoi? (*The strange statement is often made that "we" are Karma.*)

According to *The Bhagavad-Gita,* "Karma is the emanation which causes the existence and reproduction of creatures." It is, so to say, the action of the Supreme which is seen in manifestation throughout the evolution of the objective worlds.

But is not Karma to be thought of as Intelligence at work?

It is "Life's eternal way of action." Karma is that unseen and unknown law which adjusts wisely, intelligently, and equitably each effect to its cause, tracing the latter back to its producer.

Does "Karmic retribution" mean literally "an eye for an eye"?

Karma does not act in this or that particular way always. But it always *does* act so as to restore harmony and preserve the balance of equilibrium, in virtue of which the universe exists.

Is it to be presumed that different peoples or systems view Karma differently?

In orthodox Buddhism it is the eleventh *Nidana* (cause) of the "chain of causation," *Samskara.* Yet it is the power that controls all things, the resultant of moral action—the metaphysical *Samskara* or the moral effect of an act committed for the attainment of something which gratifies a personal desire.

Regarding man's life, what is the application in a general sense of this "chain of causation"?

His body is to grow and mature, wear out, and die; his mind unfold, ripen, and be harmoniously balanced; his divine Spirit to illuminate and blend easily with the *inner* man. No human being completes its grand cycle, or the "circle of necessity," until all these are accomplished.

When one dies, what insures that he will return to life again? What is the scientific argument for one's continuity?

When a being dies, he emits, as it were, a mass of force or energy, which goes to make up the new personality when he shall have reincarnated. In this energy is found the summing up of the life just given up, and by means of it the Ego is forced to assume that sort of body among those appropriate circumstances which together are the means for carrying out the decrees of Karma.

Does this mass of force or energy comprise the groups of attributes and tendencies, by the Buddhists referred to as "Skandhas" *in their chain of causation?*

It is the latter, the metaphysical personations of the "deeds" of man, whether good or bad, which, after the death of his body, incarnate themselves, so to say, and form their many invisible but never-dying compounds into a new body, or rather into an ethereal being, the *double* of what man was *morally.*

And this "new ethereal being" is . . .?

It is the "astral body" of the kabalist and the "incarnated deeds" which form the new sentient self as his *Ahankara* (the ego, self-consciousness), the personal "I."

Is it ever possible to trace one's karma to specific acts, back to "effect-producing causes" of a past existence?

We who are not Seers or Initiates, cannot know anything about the details of the working of the law of Karma. "Those who *know*" can do so by the exercise of powers which are latent even in all men. We do not know the ultimate *Cause* of Karma, just as modern philosophy universally admits that the *ultimate* Cause of anything is "unknowable."

Can the human family as a unit be said to have its bad or punishable Karma?

This cycle is known as the dark one. It is dark because spirituality is almost obscured by materiality and pure intellectualism. Revolving in the depths of material things and governed chiefly by mind apart from spirit, its characteristic gain is physical and material progress, its distinguishing loss is in spirituality. In this sense it is the Kali Yuga.

Then separate or individual Karma is conceptual rather than factual, if it exists at all?

Every atom is subject to the general law governing the whole body to which it belongs, and here we come upon the wider track of the Karmic law. It is impossible that Karma could readjust the balance of power in the world's life and progress, unless it had a broad and general line of action. It is held as a truth among Theosophists that the interdependence of Humanity is the cause of what is called Distributive Karma, and it is this law which affords the Solution to the great question of collective suffering and its relief.

Is there not a bit of conceit in the person who thinks he can help everybody—large as the world is?

It is an occult law that no man can rise superior to his individual failings without lifting, be it ever so little, the whole body of which he is an integral part.

Is it possible to make a beginning toward "overcoming Karma"?

If you have the power to face your own soul in the darkness and silence, you will have conquered the physical or animal self which dwells in sensation only.

How is it that the elemental world has become a "strong factor in the Karma of the human race"?

In the earlier ages, when we may postulate that man had not yet begun to make bad Karma, the elemental world was more friendly to him than now, because it had not yet received unfriendly impressions. But as soon as man began to become ignorant, unfriendly to himself and the rest of creation, the elemental world began to take on exactly the same complexion and returned to humanity the exact pay, so to speak, due for the actions of humanity. Thus, being unconscious and only acting according to the natural laws of its being, the elemental world is a powerful factor in the workings of Karma.

Under what law or procedure can that earlier, more favorable rapport be caused to return?

As soon as men begin to cultivate brotherly feelings and love for the whole of creation, there and then the elementals begin to take on the new condition.

There is much concern today that the demands of earth's populations, estimated at six billions of souls by the end of this century, are destined to be inadequately met. Is such concern justified?

When every individual has contributed to the general good what he can of money, of labor, and of ennobling thought, then, and only then, will the balance of national Karma be struck. And until then we have no right nor any reasons for saying that there is more life on the earth than Nature can support. It is reserved for the heroic souls, the Saviours of our Race and Nation, to find out the cause of this unequal pressure of retributive Karma, and by a supreme effort to re-adjust the balance of power, and save the people from a moral engulfment a thousand times more disastrous and more permanently evil than the like physical catastrophe, in which you seem to see the only possible outlet for this accumulated misery.

According to our teaching, all the great social evils, the distinction of classes in Society and of the sexes in the affairs of life, the unequal distribution of capital and of labour—all are due to what we tersely but truly denominate KARMA.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Philosophy Continually Reborn

The first English printing of Karl Jasper's *The Great Philosophers* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962) adds to the chain of evidence presently indicating that a new vitality and perceptiveness have entered the realm of what is usually called "professional" philosophy. Among the significant paragraphs of Dr. Jaspers' Preface are these:

> Over the last half century philosophy seems to have succumbed to irresponsibility, while at the same time casting off the chains of academicism. In our struggle to secure the substance of our own day amid the storm of arbitrary, fortuitous, anarchic thinking, we shall be helped if the historic substance can be made to break through the crusts of philosophical convention and if we learn to hear its message.
>
> A total view of the history of philosophy is impossible. We are in it. We see it from within, not from some point outside it. Yet, though we cannot survey the history of philosophy, we can look into it.
>
> We hope to enter into the world of the great philosophers, to make ourselves at home in it, because it is in their company, the best there is, that we can attain to what we ourselves are capable of being. Admittance is open to all. The dwellers in that land are glad to answer provided that we know how to inquire. They show us what they were. They encourage us and make us humble. A great philosopher wants no disciples, but men who are themselves. With all our veneration, we can come closer to them only if we ourselves philosophize.

A Chasm is Bridged

From the Theosophical outlook, as H. P. Blavatsky so often implied, philosophy and psychology cannot justifiably be separated—not without considerable danger. Dr. Jaspers continues:

> We cannot survey the great philosophers from above but must consider it a privilege to look up to them. We do not classify them in order to put them in their place, but strive to understand them in order that they may teach us and lead us to ourselves. They tell us as much as our questioning deserves, and the way they speak to us depends on the way in which we consult them. Our attitude must be to let them illuminate the area in which we ourselves come into our reality.
>
> Today it is important for us to know clearly what part of our intellectual baggage embodies the eternal orders and archetypes and is therefore worth carrying along with us. Whether philosophy, if it reached into the peoples, might help to ward off the catastrophe, or

> whether it can only enable individuals to suffer lucidly and stand up to events in the dignity of freedom grounded in transcendence, we do not know. We know only that for thousands of years the road to the ultimate insight has been traveled by philosophers, and that we should like to travel it with them.

A Road to Intelligent "Mysticism"

Jaspers' *The Great Philosophers* has a foundation in forty years of teaching—spanning many transitions of "fad" among professional arguers in the field. Then, too, the impact of science upon philosophy, as well as upon psychology, has certainly been far-reaching, and of this the author is fully aware. But science may allow itself to be concerned almost exclusively with a categorization of "facts" in unrelated departments. The *ideal* contribution of science to philosophy is by insistence on the sort of logic which will never betray itself by rationalization in behalf of a predetermined "truth." Finally, as Jasper says, "true philosophy is bound by and yet transcends science. . . . It is reason that makes philosophy 'more than science.' Reason is the source of philosophical thinking, which in its turn unfolds and develops it. Whoever knows how to think philosophically increases the power of reason in the world."

Dr. Jasper concludes the Foreword to his American edition with these sentences:

> Expressed in the form of philosophic truth, eternity may be seen in an identification of Being with the world in which Being unfolds; or, on the contrary, the world may be considered as mere appearance, a transition which rises out of, and again vanishes into, Being. It may take the form of an intensification of man's individual, unique, irreplaceable selfhood; or, on the contrary, of the submergence of all individuality in the encompassing Being in which the self loses all importance. . . .

Dr. Jaspers' Perceptions on Plato

Readers of *Isis Unveiled* will also appreciate Dr. Jaspers' treatment of Plato—with Buddha regarded by him as one of the "paradigmatic" heroes of human thought. Of "Plato's Significance," Dr. Jasper writes:

> Plato for the first time saw man in the situation of total disaster that arises through his thinking if it is false and fails to understand itself. Accordingly Plato sets the task of a radical turning of the mind. Since, with the great Sophist movement, thinking had started on the way of enlightenment, since all traditional beliefs had been shattered by

> Sophist criticism, since thought by its very nature and the conditions of men's life together seemed to lead to chaos—in view of all this it was necessary to seek the right way through thinking itself, with the instruments of the very same thought that was leading to such disaster. In Plato we see the first great movement of thought against the dangers and falsifications of enlightenment, but by way of increased enlightenment, by way of the reason that transcends the perversions of the understanding.
>
> This recurrent conflict takes its first historic form in the Platonic antithesis between Socrates and the Sophists. It is the conflict between philosophy and unphilosophy, between earnestness in bond with the source and the arbitrary thinking that knows no bond. The anti-philosopher who comes into being along with philosophical thinking, and like a Proteus in a thousand guises has accompanied it throughout history down to our own day, is for the first time consciously challenged by Plato. In this struggle with its adversary philosophy comes for the first time to itself. Plato became the source of philosophy in the crisis that never ceases even though it may be denied or talked away.

PLATO AS "PARADIGM"

Isis Unveiled begins with an emphasis on Platonic philosophy as a natural link between East and West. In "Before the Veil," discussion of Plato continues throughout. One paragraph (p. xi) familiar to many students of H.P.B. is appropriate in relation to Dr. Jaspers:

> It is the Platonic philosophy, the most elaborate compend of the abstruse systems of old India that can alone afford us middle ground. Although twenty-two and a quarter centuries have elapsed since the death of Plato, the great minds of the world are still occupied with his writings. He was, in the fullest sense of the word, the world's interpreter. And the greatest philosopher of the pre-Christian era mirrored faithfully in his works the spiritualism of the Vedic philosophers who lived thousands of years before himself, and its metaphysical expression. Vyasa, Djeminy, Kapila, Vrihaspati, Sumati, and so many others, will be found to have transmitted their indelible imprint through the intervening centuries upon Plato and his school. Thus is warranted the inference that to Plato and the ancient Hindu sages was alike revealed the same wisdom. So surviving the shock of time, what can this wisdom be but divine and eternal?

EAST-WEST PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPLORATIONS

Psychologia, described as "An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient," is now in its fourth volume. This publication will be of some interest to Theosophical students, in that it more than occasionally brings

together representatives of non-materialistic psychology in the West with the disciples of Indian and Zen thought—and evidences, occasionally, the emergence of some of the perspectives of "Theosophia." The September, 1961, issue of *Psychologia,* for instance, is devoted almost entirely to examination of the concept of Egoity, and while this magazine is published at Kyoto, chief center of Japanese Zen Buddhism, several articles are contributed by Europeans and Americans—and names which are found frequently in the weekly journal *Manas* are used as reference points in some of the discussions. In describing the content of this "special issue," the editor of *Psychologia,* Koji Sato, begins:

> The central theme is the "Self." The self has become one of the most important problems in Western psychology in these twenty years, but in the Oriental teachings on human nature the self has been one of the most cardinal problems for more than two thousand years. In the East the fundamental self has been often identified with the Supreme Being or Buddha, and therefore it has a broader area than that in the West.

For such psychologists as Erich Fromm, Viktor Frankl, Carl Rogers, and A. H. Maslow, the central problem of importance is indeed that of the nature of "The Self." In studying the works of any of these men, one senses the incipient presence of a para-cultural fraternity whose representatives explore the meaning of egoity as something beyond what might be called the *physical* aspects of mind.

Discussion on "The True Self"

Following the editorial, this issue of *Psychologia* contains a treatment —chiefly by Japanese scholars steeped in the Zen tradition—of Western psychological points of contact with Zen. There is a discussion between Dr. Carl Rogers, who recently visited Kyoto, and one Dr. Hisamatsu. The latter identifies *mind* with *self*: "Even though we say mind, however, it is not such a mind as can be viewed objectively outside of ourselves. That is, it must be such that that Mind is Myself and that I am that Mind. This Mind is not the Mind which is seen, but is, on the contrary, the Mind which sees." The other Zen scholars agreed; one, by saying that "the True Self is this Mind," and another with the words, "the True Self is at the same time the Mind and the Buddha."

If "Mind" is simply an efflorescence of the physical organism, the proper use of this mind obviously lies in convenient manipulations of one's environment, but if the true Mind is primary, instead of secondary,

it is the realization of the nature of that self—also the Self of All—which constitutes fundamental knowledge.

ZEN VIEWS ON CARL JUNG

It is not difficult to understand why Zen psychologists have all been interested in the works of the author of *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.* (Theosophical publications, also, have been aware of touches of Theosophical psychology in Dr. Jung's writings.) In the *Psychologia* discussion, one is also able to note, however, a Zen perspective on Jung which suggests an incompleteness in Jungian psychology, perhaps paralleling Theosophical criticism of Jung's apparent failure to get beyond a kind of eclecticism. Prof. Masao Abe puts it this way:

> Jung's idea of the collective unconscious is interesting from the Zen point of view, but there is an essential difference between the self in Jungian psychology and that of Zen. The self in Jungian psychology, I understand, consists of the conscious which is called "I" and the unconscious. Now, when Western psychologists, including Jung, discuss the unconscious, they do so from the standpoint of consciousness, namely standing on the side of the conscious and looking at the unconscious. However deep and basic the unconscious may be taken, it is understood as relative to consciousness from the side of consciousness. Jung's so-called "self" is the whole of such unconsciousness and consciousness which seems to me to have a kind of framework. It is quite different in Zen. Zen does not discuss the unconscious or so-called no-mind from the side of consciousness, nor does it stay in the unconscious in Jung's sense. It is the way of Zen to go deep into the unconscious and break through its bottom through sitting and struggling with *koan.* Zen asks us to break through the framework of self.

THE INFLUENCE OF A. H. MASLOW

The most valuable paper in the September *Psychologia,* though, is supplied by Robert Schwitzgebel of Brandeis University, who represents the "self-actualization" school of A. H. Maslow. The perspective is indicated by these two brief paragraphs:

> There is one "confession" that almost anyone will make to even the most casual sympathetic listener. It is this: That somehow what he has been *taught* is far removed from what he *needs to know,* that what he is able to express is inadequate in dealing with what he feels. The separation of our so-called factual, scientific, precise, acceptable knowledge from our day-to-day feelings, hopes, pains, urges is a common observation.
>
> The individual's emphasis on one side or the other of this dialectic

is in part a function of cultural influence. The West has tended to favor technical elaboration while the East has traditionally favored transformation of consciousness. It may be that developments in the broad field of psychology and related disciplines within the last decade or so make possible for the first time a realistic hope of synthesis.

"Beyond the Self"

Schwitzgebel endeavors to show that Maslow's conception of "self-actualization" does not leave out of account dimensions *beyond* any selfhood that a man can realize consciously and fully define. Maslow, for instance, recognizes that when one breaks through the many areas of the "not self," there is still the call to a further expansion beyond the usual conception of individuality. Dr. Schwitzgebel continues:

> The self—even the actualized self—is not all there is. From what we understand, the world was before man was. It is customary for individuals to assume that something will continue after they themselves no longer exist. Death makes the final nonsense out of power dedicated to the self.
>
> The ability to focus or to merge with a larger whole does not require a purposeful negation of the self. Quite to the contrary. The greater mystery, the greater pleasure, the truer perception is *beyond* (not before) the actualized self. These new experiences are the intrinsic reward of growth. The mechanisms of healthy development are thus not something that has to be "put in" after something else is "taken out." However we define psychological maturity, it is likely to parallel physiological maturity in the earlier years of the organism, and physiologically we know that there will be no adult (or a crippled adult) if we kill or main the child. John Dewey nicely analyzed the reluctance of some persons to accept a Self-actualization point-of-view when he pointed to the fallacy of "transforming the (truistic) fact of acting *as* a self into the fiction of acting always *for* self."

"Proto-Science" in Indian Philosophy

The central theme in Prof. Dale Riepe's *Naturalistic Tradition in Indian Thought* (University of Washington Press, 1961) is that most Western scholars have overlooked indications of a typically scientific perspective in the works of many early Eastern thinkers. Prof. Riepe points out, for instance, that, in the words of such philosophers as Kapila, supra-rational authority is denied and emphasis placed upon a natural conception of evolution. He sees that the choice of Arjuna in *The Bhagavad-Gita* is finally "to exalt the life of action, the life of warfare between the opposing tendencies of an individual's desires, good

and evil." Prof. Riepe then traces the many ways in which the "naturalists" in Indian philosophy sought to escape the overbearing weight of prayerful reliance upon the gods, as represented by the Brahmanical caste. He quotes the work of J. N. Mukerji:

> This Epic culture began as a reaction against the faith in the super-rational authority and the ritualistic ethics of the Brahmans. The peculiar features of the Epic culture are its broad-based Humanism, Rationalism and the consequent distaste for the supernatural. The most convincing evidence of this contention is found in the logical outlook of Samkya and the new significance attached to the concept of Karma.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF KAPILA

H. P. Blavatsky's references to Kapila are numerous, in *Isis Unveiled,* in some of her articles, and receive the fullest development in *The Secret Doctrine.* Here she points out that while Kapila might be regarded by the Brahmans as the Eastern equivalent of a "materialist," he was simply emphasizing the need for rigorous philosophical discipline in the delineation of a scheme of evolution which does not "leave matter out." H.P.B. writes:

> In Kapila's "Sankhya" Philosophy, unless, allegorically speaking, Purusha mounts on the shoulders of Prakriti, the latter remains irrational, while the former remains inactive without her. Therefore Nature (in man) must become a compound of Spirit and Matter before he becomes what he is; and the Spirit latent in Matter must be awakened to life and consciousness gradually. The Monad has to pass through its mineral, vegetable and animal forms, before the Light of the Logos is awakened in the animal man. Therefore, till then, the latter cannot be referred to as "MAN," but has to be regarded as a Monad imprisoned in ever changing forms. *Evolution,* not *creation,* by means of WORDS is recognized in the philosophies of the East, even in their exoteric records. *Ex oriente lux.* (*S.D.* II, 42.)

INTEREST IN PROFESSOR RIEPE'S WORK

Attention paid to the book *The Naturalistic Tradition in Indian Thought* by some reviewers indicates that a number of men are seeking to recognize the mutuality of essential philosophic concerns in the Eastern and Western traditions. An *Eastern World* summary of the volume (January) contains this paragraph:

> The connection between Indian philosophy and medicine, mathematics, astronomy and technology is still not fully realised. To most

people, Indian philosophy is synonymous with mysticism and sometimes with puzzling irrationalism. Yet, as Prof. Riepe points out, the material available in European languages alone has revealed the startling fact that Indian philosophy contained a considerable amount of philosophical naturalism, or realism. From this naturalistic outlook stemmed scientific ideas, which, however, did not always come to fruition at the same speed as in Italy or Western Europe. This carefully annotated account explains to what extent naturalistic thought or trends are to be found in the golden years of Indian philosophical thought.

Another Correlation

In *Isis Unveiled,* H.P.B. again indicates that Kapila was *not* a materialist, but rather one who used skepticism and sarcasm to attack the pretentiousness of Brahmans who pretended to personal converse with Deity. "Kapila," she writes (*Isis* I, 307), "cuts with the sharp sword of his sarcasms the Brahman-Yoggins, who in their mystical visions pretend to see the HIGHEST *one.*" In other words, Kapila and many another Hindu philosopher attack what was held "sacred" by entrenched religion in their time in order that what Prof. Riepe calls "proto-science" might be born. But Kapila did not dismiss the essential teachings of the Vedas and the Upanishads, instead sought a synthesis. It is apparently something of this perception which motivates another paragraph of review on *The Naturalistic Tradition in Indian Thought* in the *Personalist* for Spring, 1962:

> It must be acknowledged that Western interest in Indian thought is often animated by impure motives. Too often the Vedas and the Upanishads are treated as reservoirs of mysticism from which the tired rationalist and materialist may draw compensating drafts. There are two serious faults in this attitude. First, the mysticism of the orient is by nature far more *intellectual* than most Western thinkers have been prepared to allow; and secondly, to quote the author, the prevailing tendency has been "to make Indian thought suspect of considerably more mysticism and irrationalism than it actually contained."

One Man's Protest

The following letter, written to the Vancouver *Sun* (Canada), May 4, considers the moral issues of renewed nuclear weapons testing—calling attention not only to the interdependence of the intelligent forces of Nature, but also to man's unity with these forces and his responsibility for their proper use:

> The stern warning of Sir Bernard Lovell regarding the U.S. proposal to explode hydrogen bombs in the earth's radiation-belt recalls the old

Greek philosophical principle of Hubris and Nemesis. ("Those we call the Ancients," wrote Pascal, "were really new in everything.")

Hubris and Nemesis represented the dual aspect of causality in the vital relationship of man to Nature.

Hubris implied the ignorant and blasphemous disregard by man of the laws and processes of Nature in his pursuit of short-term private ends. It was applied to the actions of a man who has no sense of the beauty, wonder and holiness of Nature, no sense of the delicate organic balance of its forces, no sense of his debt to it, and no sense of any obligation to co-operate with its laws if only for the sake of his own lasting comfort and well-being.

NATURE'S IMPLACABLE LAW

This is not "superstition." It is—self-evidently to anyone who can use his brains—the way Nature works in all departments of life both moral and physical, and one only wishes there were some way of hammering such elementary truths into the heads and hearts of the militarists and alleged statesmen of all countries. Unfortunately there is no means of doing so: they are fully determined to learn it the hard way. And they would be quite welcome to their pig-headed fate if it were not for the universal implications of such folly. When they take it upon themselves to involve the whole of Nature and Humanity in the myopic ends of international power politics they may well be asked if they are prepared to shoulder so colossal a debt to Life.

The writer of the letter, Mr. Maurice Lowe, goes on to say that "one of the best arguments for the immortality of the human soul is that Nature, via Hubris and Nemesis, calls for a complete settlement of all accounts, and many of us already owe debts to Life that cannot be fully paid within the limits of a single lifetime." He concludes by quoting Omar Khayyam's familiar lines on Karma-Nemesis:

> The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line
> Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

REQUEST TO CONTRIBUTORS

All manuscripts submitted to THEOSOPHY should be double-spaced —*including* the quotations—with at least one inch margin at bottom of page. If the page reference for a quotation is not given in the body of the article, it would greatly facilitate staff work if exact reference is jotted down on the margin (pencil will do).